

**To:** CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]  
**Cc:** []  
**From:** CN=Bruce Herbold/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US  
**Sent:** Thur 5/31/2012 12:08:14 AM  
**Subject:** comments on App C  
[Appendix C commentsBH53012.docx](#)

I have tried to be more positive in my tone -- which is somewhat easier because this is a better document than some I have reviewed. But I fear I still sound too curmudgeonly.

My biggest gripe is that the conclusions do not always relate to the analysis -- e.g.. DO will be fixed by a bubbler so we don't need to report the modeling results. Or that conclusions about things which we understand and have a scientific basis for are mixed equally with things which are pure WAG's.

I'm back in the office next Thursday&Friday

Bruce Herbold  
USEPA Fish Biologist  
(415) 972 3460

"If 90% of the ideas you generate aren't absolutely worthless, then you're not generating enough ideas". --  
Michael Artin